REMARKS

Claims 1-45 were examined by the Office, and all claims are rejected. With this response claims 1, 10, 14, 15, 24, 28, 29 and 30-45 are amended. All amendments are fully supported by the specification as originally filed. The amendments find support at least from page 11, lines 27-31 of the specification. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections in light of the following remarks.

Claim Rejections Under § 101

In section 3, on page 2 of the Office Action, claims 29-42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 29-42 are amended to recite "A computer program product comprising a computer readable storage structure embodying computer program code thereon for execution by a computer processor." Applicant respectfully submits that claims 29-42 as amended are statutory.

Claim Rejections Under § 103

In section 5, on page 3 of the Office Action, claims 1-5, 8-19, 22-33 and 36-45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Schilit et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,674,453) in view of "Sams Teach Yourself Microsoft Internet Explorer 5 in 10 Minutes," by Jill T. Freeze (hereinafter Freeze). Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is not disclosed or suggested by the cited references, alone or in combination, because the cited references fail to disclose or suggest all of the limitations recited in claim 1. Claim 1 is amended to particularly point out and distinctly claim determining a link area comprising a plurality of links nearest to a first point on said view window, in order to clarify that the "link area" includes multiple links. Applicant respectfully submits that at least this limitation of claim 1 is not disclosed or suggested by the cited references.

On page 3 of the Office Action the Office acknowledges that Schilit fails to disclose determining a link area nearest to a first point on the view window, and relies upon Freeze for this teaching. However, Freeze only discloses showing a URL for a link on which a pointer of a user's mouse has been placed over. Therefore, Freeze at most discloses determining when the user's mouse pointer is over a link, and it is not determined which link is closest, but instead only which link the pointer has been placed over. Freeze does not disclose or suggest

determining which link is closest to the pointer, because no URL is displayed unless the pointer is directly over the link. Freeze does not teach or suggest that a URL may be displayed when the pointer is not directly over a link. Therefore, when the pointer is not over a link, no URL is displayed, i.e. no determination is made as to which link is closest to the point, as recited in claim 1.

In order to further clarify the distinction between the present invention and the cited references, claim 1 is amended to recite that the link area comprises a plurality of links. Therefore, it is determined which link area, which is comprised of multiple links, is closest to the first point. In contrast to amended claim 1, Freeze only discloses determining when the pointer of a user's mouse is over a single link. One of skill in the art would not be motivated to combine the teachings of Freeze and Schilit, because the teachings of Freeze are limited to a single link. The purpose of moving the mouse pointer over the link is to display the URL so that the user knows where they are going before clicking on the link. See Freeze "Where am I going?" The mouse pointer must be directly over the link in order to show the user where the user is going, and therefore Freeze cannot provide any teaching or suggestion of determining the closest "link area comprised of a plurality of links" to the pointer, as recited in claim 1. For at least this reason, the cited references alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest all of the limitations recited in amended claim 1.

Independent claims 15 and 29 are rejected for the same reasons as claim 1, and are amended to contain limitations similar to those recited in claim 1. Therefore, for at least the reasons discussed above in relation to claim 1, claims 15 and 29 are not disclosed or suggested by the cited references.

Claims 2-5, 8-14, 16-19, 22-28, 30-33 and 36-45 all ultimately depend from an indpendent claim, and are not disclosed or suggested by the cited references at least in view of their dependencies.

In section 6, on page 8 of the Office Action, claims 6-7, 20-21 and 34-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schilit in view of Freeze, and in further view of "Microsoft Windows XP Unleashed," by Terry W. Ogletree (hereinafter Ogletree). Claims 6-7, 20-21 and 34-35 all ultimately depend from an independent claim, and

therefore are not disclosed or suggested by the cited references at least in view of their dependencies.

Furthermore, claim 6 recites that the first point is a stationary point on the view window, and the link area nearest to the stationary point is indicated visually on the display of the electronic device. On page 8 of the Office Action, the Office acknowledges that Schilit and Freeze fail to disclose that the first point is a stationary point on the view window and relies upon Ogletree for this teaching. However, Ogletree also fails to disclose or suggest a stationary point, because contrary to the assertions of the Office, Ogletree does not disclose or suggest placing the cursor in a stationary position and navigating the window with the arrow keys. Instead, Ogletree teaches using the numeric keypad to move the mouse pointer, and therefore the mouse pointer is not stationary as recited in claim 6. For at least this additional reason, claim 6 is not disclosed or suggested by the cited references, either alone or in combination. Claims 20 and 34 contain limiations similar to those recited in claim 6, and therefore are also not disclosed or suggested by the cited references for at least the reasons discussed above in relation to claim 6.

Conclusion

The rejections of the Office Action having been obviated by amendment or shown to be inapplicable, withdrawal thereof is requested, and passage to issue of the present application is earnestly solicited. The undersigned hereby authorizes the Commissioner to charge deposit account 23-0442 for any fee deficiency required to submit this response.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 10 May 2007

Keith R. Obert
Attorney for the Applicant
Registration No. 58,051

KRO/kas
WARE, FRESSOLA, VAN DER SLUYS
    & ADOLPHSON LLP
755 Main Street, P.O. Box 224
Monroe, CT 06468
Telephone: (203) 261-1234
Facsimile: (203) 261-5676
Customer No. 004955